

# Exhibit A

## PRETRIAL HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROY S. PAYNE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Mr. James A. Shimota  
18 Ms. Katherine L. Allor  
19 K&L Gates LLP  
20 70 West Madison Street  
21 Suite 3100  
22 Chicago, IL 60602  
23  
24 Mr. Alan E. Littmann  
Mr. Shaun Zhang  
Ms. Jennifer M. Hartjes  
Goldman Ismail Tomaselli Brennan &  
Baum, LLP  
200 South Wacker Drive  
22nd Floor  
Chicago, IL 60606

1 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: Mr. Connor J. Meggs  
2 K&L Gates LLP  
3 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard  
4 8th Floor  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067

6 Ms. Courtney Neufeld  
7 K&L Gates LLP  
8 925 Fourth Avenue  
9 Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98104

10 Mr. Johnny Ward  
11 Ward, Smith & Hill, PLLC  
12 1507 Bill Owens Parkway  
Longview, TX 75604

13 FOR THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Daniel Reisner  
14 Ms. Elizabeth A. Long  
15 Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, NY 10019

16 Mr. Deron R. Dacus  
17 The Dacus Firm, PC  
18 821 ESE Loop 323  
19 Suite 430  
20 Tyler, TX 75701

21 COURT REPORTER: Ms. Shelly Holmes, CSR, TCRR  
22 Official Court Reporter  
Honorable Robert W. Schroeder III  
United States District Judge  
Eastern District of Texas  
Texarkana Division  
500 North State Line Avenue  
Texarkana, Texas 75501  
shelly\_holmes@txed.uscourts.gov

23 (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript  
24 produced on a CAT system.)

09:25:18  
09:25:18

25

09:25:18 1                   COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

09:25:19 2                   THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.

09:34:57 3                   For the record, we're here for the completion of

09:35:04 4 the final pretrial conference in Entropic Communications

09:35:10 5 versus Charter Communications, which is Case No. 2:22-125

09:35:14 6 on our docket.

09:35:15 7                   Would counsel state their appearances for the

09:35:18 8 record?

09:35:18 9                   MR. WARD: Good morning, Your Honor. Johnny Ward,

09:35:24 10 along with Alan Littmann, Jim Shimota, Jenny Hartjes,

09:35:30 11 Shaun Zhang, Connor Meggs, Katie Allor, and Courtney

09:35:37 12 Neufeld. I didn't mess that up.

09:35:37 13                   THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ward.

09:35:37 14                   MR. WARD: I think I got it. All right.

09:35:37 15                   THE COURT: Thank you. You've obviously had your

09:35:39 16 coffee already this morning.

09:35:39 17                   MR. WARD: Well, I mean, I had one job. They said

09:35:42 18 if you mess it up, you won't get to speak again. Despite

09:35:43 19 my efforts to mess it up, I apparently got it right.

09:35:46 20                   THE COURT: Well, congratulations.

09:35:48 21                   Good morning, Mr. Dacus.

09:35:49 22                   MR. DACUS: Good morning, Your Honor. Deron

09:35:51 23 Dacus, here with Betsy Long and Dan Reisner on behalf of

09:35:55 24 Charter, Your Honor, and we're ready to proceed.

09:35:57 25                   THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Dacus.

09:35:59 1           We've got a number of matters on the agenda today,  
09:36:05 2 and a couple of them relate to motions filed since the last  
09:36:10 3 time we gathered. Why don't we go ahead and address those  
09:36:16 4 first. We can start with Charter's motion for protective  
09:36:24 5 order, and let me hear first from -- actually, let me hear  
09:36:29 6 from Plaintiff on that motion first.

09:36:43 7           Good morning, Mr. Littmann.

09:36:47 8           MR. LITTMANN: Good morning, Your Honor.

09:36:50 9           Your Honor, as the briefing noted, this relates to  
09:36:54 10 the order that you issued with respect to Dr. Almeroth's  
09:37:00 11 opinion. Entropic had moved to strike two paragraphs in  
09:37:04 12 Dr. Almeroth's supplemental opinion, and those were  
09:37:09 13 relating to newly produced evidence regarding Mr. Stafford  
09:37:15 14 and what Mr. Stafford told Dr. Almeroth, as well as some  
09:37:20 15 exhibits that were produced for the first time, along with  
09:37:22 16 his report.

09:37:23 17           We had moved to strike those. Your Honor denied  
09:37:25 18 our motion to strike, but ordered that they produce two  
09:37:31 19 witnesses for one hour each. One was Mr. Stafford to  
09:37:36 20 discuss what he had told Dr. Almeroth, and the other was a  
09:37:39 21 corporate representative to discuss the exhibit that was  
09:37:43 22 produced with Dr. Almeroth's report.

09:37:44 23           Your Honor noted that it would be prejudicial to  
09:37:49 24 present the evidence to the jury without allowing  
09:37:51 25 discovery.

09:37:51 1                 THE COURT: So why doesn't their withdrawal of  
09:37:54 2 those paragraphs moot the need for the deposition?

09:37:58 3                 MR. LITTMANN: So we asked for clarification about  
09:38:01 4 what that withdrawal actually entailed, and I think herein  
09:38:05 5 lies the rub is that we don't actually believe what they're  
09:38:08 6 really doing is withdrawing any reliance on those  
09:38:11 7 paragraphs because what they're -- what they really want to  
09:38:13 8 do, we believe, is to still bring Mr. Stafford to testify  
09:38:18 9 about exactly what he was -- what's disclosed in  
09:38:21 10 Dr. Almeroth's report. He wasn't -- Mr. Stafford hasn't  
09:38:25 11 been deposed since then.

09:38:27 12                 And then they want their experts, and they  
09:38:29 13 expressly said that, that they reserve the right to have  
09:38:32 14 any witness discuss the substance of those paragraphs,  
09:38:34 15 including experts, to the extent otherwise disclosed in  
09:38:37 16 their report.

09:38:37 17                 So we don't know what else those -- that's a  
09:38:42 18 direct quote. And so we don't know what else they are  
09:38:44 19 going to be relying on if Mr. Stafford comes in here and  
09:38:48 20 presents that evidence. And that's the exact evidence, as  
09:38:52 21 Your Honor noted, would be prejudicial without giving us an  
09:38:54 22 opportunity to conduct discovery on it.

09:38:57 23                 Furthermore, the screenshots, that DX-24  
09:39:05 24 screenshot was something that only came in, and the only  
09:39:08 25 witness that it was disclosed through is Dr. Almeroth. And

09:39:11 1 they've refused to exclude that as well. And so in that  
09:39:16 2 situation, nobody else has indicated they can testify on it  
09:39:16 3 or that they would be introducing that evidence through  
09:39:19 4 anyone else.

09:39:19 5 And so by refusing to exclude that, I think what  
09:39:23 6 it does is it gives us a pretty good indication that  
09:39:26 7 actually they're not really withdrawing those paragraphs at  
09:39:28 8 all. What they're doing is they're trying to circumvent  
09:39:31 9 this Court's order and just trying to get it in through  
09:39:34 10 other means without giving us the opportunity to conduct  
09:39:37 11 discovery on that.

09:39:37 12 And, obviously, as we come up to trial, I think  
09:39:39 13 what -- you know, it's always dangerous in front of a jury  
09:39:42 14 to be asking questions that we don't know the answers to.  
09:39:45 15 And I think that's exactly what they're trying to do right  
09:39:50 16 now is trying to say, you know, take your chances, but  
09:39:51 17 we're not going to give you the discovery on the very  
09:39:53 18 things that the Court ordered discovery to be provided on.

09:39:56 19 THE COURT: To the extent that your concern deals  
09:40:00 20 with what Dr. Almeroth might say, I think that's something  
09:40:04 21 that I can address with the defense counsel in a moment.

09:40:09 22 But as long as Dr. Almeroth is not going to  
09:40:17 23 express opinions related to those two paragraphs, how are  
09:40:21 24 you not in the same position you would have been if we had  
09:40:24 25 simply granted your motion to strike?

09:40:27 1 MR. LITTMANN: Well, I think -- I think that  
09:40:30 2 primarily revolves around the DX-24, that exhibit, because  
09:40:36 3 if -- if Your Honor wants to revisit and grant the motion  
09:40:39 4 to strike, I think that is one way of resolving it.  
09:40:44 5 However, I still think that the DX-24 needs to be excluded  
09:40:47 6 because our understanding was that came in solely through  
09:40:49 7 Dr. Almeroth and those -- and those paragraphs. And so we  
09:40:55 8 understand that had that been granted, there was nobody  
09:40:58 9 else to actually lay a foundation for that exhibit. There  
09:41:01 10 was nobody else that would have been able to testify about  
09:41:03 11 it at all. It wasn't related back to what Mr. Stafford  
09:41:07 12 said.

09:41:07 13 And in that situation, Mr. Bakewell, their damages  
09:41:09 14 expert, also doesn't rely on it. He relies on other  
09:41:13 15 conversations he had with Mr. Stafford, but he doesn't rely  
09:41:17 16 on that exhibit.

09:41:18 17 So I think that's where -- that's where there  
09:41:20 18 would still be a difference, and there would still be  
09:41:23 19 something up for discussion.

09:41:24 20 And -- and I understand that certainly had  
09:41:27 21 Your Honor granted that motion and been excluded or if --  
09:41:31 22 you know, if it is, you know, hard and fast that they don't  
09:41:33 23 simply get to introduce all of this information by other  
09:41:37 24 means, at least through Dr. Almeroth through other means, I  
09:41:41 25 think we're going to have a situation where we're in front

09:41:43 1 of a jury, Mr. Stafford is going to come in, he's going to  
09:41:47 2 testify to this. Dr. Almeroth is likely going to be  
09:41:49 3 sitting there listening. And whether the jury is going to  
09:41:52 4 be able to understand what Dr. Almeroth is relying on and  
09:41:55 5 whether he's going to be able to sort of put on blinders  
09:41:58 6 and say, well, no, I'm not really -- I'm not really relying  
09:42:00 7 on the things I just heard Mr. Stafford say, and he sort of  
09:42:04 8 unlearned those things that he heard before or have the  
09:42:07 9 jury conclude somehow that, you know, Dr. Almeroth isn't  
09:42:10 10 actually listening to that portion but he's -- and not  
09:42:13 11 really resting his opinion on that portion but on something  
09:42:16 12 else, I think that's going to create quite a bit of  
09:42:19 13 confusion at the trial.

09:42:20 14 And I think the easiest way to resolve that would  
09:42:22 15 be to go with what your order originally said, which is  
09:42:25 16 simply let's just conduct the depositions. They're short.  
09:42:28 17 We can still get them done. We're prepared to do it  
09:42:31 18 tomorrow. And I think it avoids the surprise and the  
09:42:36 19 complications of having everybody wonder kind of what  
09:42:40 20 exactly is Dr. Almeroth relying on when he's sitting in the  
09:42:45 21 court listening to these statements.

09:42:47 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Littmann.

09:42:54 23 MR. LITTMANN: Thank you.

09:42:56 24 MR. REISNER: Your Honor, the -- the exhibit,  
09:43:00 25 DTX-24, that Entropic is concerned about was already

09:43:03 1 pre-admitted, so I don't understand why we're here debating  
09:43:07 2 that today.

09:43:07 3 Ms. -- Dr. Almeroth's not going to testify about  
09:43:13 4 DTX-24. That doesn't mean that Mr. Stafford can't testify  
09:43:18 5 about that. This -- this was disclosed in the September  
09:43:22 6 7th interrogatory response, this -- these screenshots  
09:43:27 7 showing them -- showing the [REDACTED]. If they  
09:43:30 8 thought that they were entitled and needed a deposition of  
09:43:34 9 Mr. Stafford, they should have raised it then, not on the  
09:43:38 10 eve of trial.

09:43:39 11 It's going to be -- it would be highly prejudicial  
09:43:42 12 to us to have to prepare and offer Mr. Stafford to testify  
09:43:47 13 on Sunday, the day before trial begins while we have a lot  
09:43:50 14 of other things that we have to do for something that they  
09:43:56 15 have no excuse for not raising back in September or  
09:44:02 16 earlier. We disclosed the [REDACTED] in an earlier  
09:44:06 17 interrogatory response on August 10th.

09:44:09 18 THE COURT: Well, talk to me, Mr. Reisner, about  
09:44:17 19 why shouldn't I, then, just take the path of simply  
09:44:20 20 granting the motion to strike as to those two paragraphs  
09:44:24 21 and there being, therefore, no ambiguity about  
09:44:31 22 Dr. Almeroth's ability to testify about that.

09:44:35 23 MR. REISNER: Yeah, we -- Your Honor, we -- we  
09:44:36 24 think you should -- you should do that. The only thing I  
09:44:39 25 want to clarify, okay, is that Dr. Almeroth, in his earlier

09:44:46 1 expert report, already offered an opinion acknowledging  
09:44:52 2 that [REDACTED]. He -- he didn't offer an opinion  
09:44:55 3 on this exhibit. He's not going to testify that he thinks  
09:44:58 4 this exhibit shows it was shut down or that he even thinks  
09:45:02 5 it was shut down.

09:45:03 6 But -- but he does -- he should be able to offer  
09:45:07 7 an opinion that you can't have infringement of method  
09:45:10 8 claims if you're not practicing them. And that opinion was  
09:45:13 9 disclosed previously. He won't -- he won't testify as to  
09:45:20 10 anything that's in these paragraphs that are stricken that  
09:45:22 11 wasn't disclosed earlier.

09:45:26 12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Reisner.  
09:45:34 13 Mr. Littmann, I'll give you the last word on that.  
09:45:37 14 MR. LITTMANN: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll make  
09:45:38 15 it quick.

09:45:39 16 Just to clarify, Your Honor, what Dr. Almeroth  
09:45:47 17 testified to before is that the project was -- or what he  
09:45:52 18 wrote in his report was that the project was stalled. He  
09:45:55 19 didn't describe any basis for why it was allegedly shut  
09:45:59 20 down. And that's what Mr. Stafford's testimony and that's  
09:46:02 21 what the exhibit elaborate upon. And so it's not the same  
09:46:09 22 as what he had disclosed before at all.

09:46:11 23 I'm looking at Paragraph 183 of his report. He  
09:46:14 24 says: Right now the project is stalled, and it did not get  
09:46:18 25 the go-ahead -- he's quoting the Charter witness -- from

09:46:21 1 our executive management to deploy on a larger scale. So  
09:46:24 2 he doesn't describe the mechanism or the basis on which  
09:46:26 3 they claim they shut it down.

09:46:28 4 And so we still think that what -- what we need  
09:46:32 5 here is a deposition to understand what exactly it is that  
09:46:37 6 happened. Their -- their witnesses are clearly going to  
09:46:40 7 rely on it. We don't know how Mr. Stafford could possibly  
09:46:42 8 come in and testify to the late-produced exhibit that --  
09:46:48 9 that was produced when Dr. Almeroth actually issued his  
09:46:53 10 report when that was not produced through -- or we were not  
09:46:56 11 given an opportunity to depose Mr. Stafford on it. It was  
09:47:00 12 given to us through Dr. Almeroth.

09:47:02 13 THE COURT: Do you dispute that that exhibit has  
09:47:04 14 been pre-admitted?

09:47:05 15 MR. LITTMANN: We did not object to that. We did  
09:47:08 16 not object to that exhibit. So, yes, I agree that we did  
09:47:11 17 not object to that exhibit, however, we did not object to  
09:47:13 18 it because we believed that it rose and fell with  
09:47:17 19 Dr. Almeroth -- Almeroth's opinions on those particular  
09:47:20 20 paragraphs which we moved to strike.

09:47:22 21 And so because he was the only witness that was --  
09:47:27 22 that was there that had offered that evidence, that was --  
09:47:31 23 that was our understanding.

09:47:32 24 So if -- if we're being told now that what  
09:47:36 25 Mr. Stafford is going to do is he's going to testify about

09:47:38 1 that exhibit, then frankly we can cut this short, limit it  
09:47:43 2 to one deposition, and just have Mr. Stafford testify about  
09:47:44 3 that exhibit. And that would be -- that would make it  
09:47:48 4 easier for everybody.

09:47:49 5 THE COURT: Well, to the extent, Mr. Littmann,  
09:47:51 6 that you made these decisions based on strategic moves, I  
09:48:00 7 think it's too late now to walk those back.

09:48:03 8 I'm going to amend the order on Dr. Almeroth's  
09:48:13 9 opinions -- in other words, the order on your motion to  
09:48:17 10 strike -- to grant it as to those two additional  
09:48:23 11 paragraphs. I do find that that moots the Court's order  
09:48:29 12 regarding the additional depositions. And whether or not  
09:48:38 13 Mr. Stafford's testimony about that document is appropriate  
09:48:47 14 as fact testimony is something that you can object to  
09:48:50 15 contemporaneously if you think he's exceeded the scope of  
09:48:54 16 what a fact witness can provide.

09:48:56 17 MR. LITTMANN: Thank you, Your Honor. Understood.

09:48:58 18 THE COURT: All right. So the Defendant's motion  
09:49:05 19 for protective order is granted to that extent.

09:49:08 20 That takes us to the Plaintiff's motion to  
09:49:14 21 dismiss, and I'd like to hear from the Plaintiff first on  
09:49:21 22 that.

09:49:21 23 MR. ZHANG: Good morning, Your Honor. This is  
09:49:28 24 Shaun Zhang on behalf of Entropic.

09:49:29 25 THE COURT: Good morning.

09:49:29 1 MR. ZHANG: In accordance with the Court's order  
09:49:32 2 and the practice of this -- of this Court, we informed  
09:49:36 3 Charter that we are not proceeding to trial on three of the  
09:49:40 4 six asserted patents. In response to that, Charter  
09:49:43 5 requested that we dismiss those claims on those patents  
09:49:46 6 with prejudice.

09:49:46 7 And we informed them, based on the precedent of  
09:49:49 8 this Court, that the effect of withdrawing claims and  
09:49:52 9 narrowing the issues before trial was a dismissal without  
09:49:55 10 prejudice, and that's really the dispute before the Court.  
09:49:58 11 It wouldn't be a dispute if Charter didn't insist that the  
09:50:03 12 dismissal would be with prejudice. Our motion memorializes  
09:50:05 13 the effect -- and it's the norm in this Court that when  
09:50:08 14 issues are narrowed and claims are withdrawn, that that is  
09:50:10 15 done without prejudice.

09:50:11 16 THE COURT: Do you intend to or does Entropic  
09:50:14 17 intend to reassert these three patents against Charter in  
09:50:20 18 some other proceeding?

09:50:21 19 MR. ZHANG: Your Honor, I -- I can't speak to that  
09:50:24 20 specific question. The motion really is only filed because  
09:50:29 21 this issue was raised by Charter. This exact issue  
09:50:34 22 was actually -- typically this issue doesn't get brought  
09:50:37 23 up, so we don't have a lot of precedent on this, but this  
09:50:38 24 exact issue was addressed in the Constellation case,  
09:50:41 25 Constellation versus LG before Judge Gilstrap earlier this

09:50:44 1 year.

09:50:45 2 There, the Defendant also contested that the  
09:50:47 3 dismissal should be with prejudice with -- of claims that  
09:50:50 4 were withdrawn and narrowed before trial, same as that  
09:50:54 5 issue went before Judge Gilstrap, and Judge Gilstrap  
09:50:56 6 granted the motion without prejudice. And I have copies of  
09:51:00 7 that -- of that order, if that would be helpful, Your  
09:51:02 8 Honor.

09:51:02 9 THE COURT: You know, I'm -- I am familiar with  
09:51:04 10 that issue. It has a lot to do with the stage of the  
09:51:08 11 proceedings and the purpose of the narrowing. If it is  
09:51:18 12 simply involving claims of a patent, we never have an issue  
09:51:24 13 with that. If it's the patent itself, that's a little  
09:51:27 14 broader.

09:51:30 15 But the Defendant has a legitimate concern if the  
09:51:34 16 Plaintiff is withdrawing those with the intent to reurge  
09:51:38 17 them elsewhere. And it's concerning to me if you're not in  
09:51:44 18 a position to comment on that.

09:51:47 19 MR. ZHANG: Your Honor, might I confer with  
09:51:51 20 co-counsel on this?

09:51:52 21 THE COURT: Yes.

09:52:28 22 MR. ZHANG: Thank you, Your Honor.

09:52:29 23 After conferring with co-counsel, we can confirm  
09:52:32 24 that these patents that were withdrawn as part of this  
09:52:36 25 litigation, those three patents we don't intend to assert

09:52:40 1 again against Charter. There are family members in one of  
09:52:41 2 those patents that we reserve the right to assert against  
09:52:43 3 Charter and other Defendants.

09:52:45 4 THE COURT: Well, the way I would likely resolve  
09:52:46 5 this, then, is to grant your request to dismiss without  
09:52:53 6 prejudice, but to condition it upon the payment by Entropic  
09:52:59 7 to Charter of Charter's fees in the event that you do  
09:53:06 8 reurge these same patents against Charter in another forum.

09:53:11 9 I think -- I've always felt that addresses the  
09:53:16 10 primary concern that the Defendants have in terms of being  
09:53:20 11 put to the expense of recreating their defense in the event  
09:53:27 12 they're reurged.

09:53:29 13 But let me hear from the Defendants on that point.  
09:53:33 14 Thank you --

09:53:33 15 MR. ZHANG: Thank you.

09:53:34 16 THE COURT: -- Mr. Zhang.

09:53:37 17 MR. REISNER: As Your Honor has already  
09:53:43 18 recognized, that's -- you know, our concern is that  
09:53:47 19 January, some time next year, sometime in the near future,  
09:53:51 20 if these patents are dropped without prejudice, Entropic  
09:53:54 21 will turn around and file a new lawsuit, we'll have new  
09:53:59 22 discovery, new theories, and we'll be litigating the same  
09:54:01 23 issues and new issues and a new trial at great expense and  
09:54:05 24 inconvenience to our witnesses and disruption of our  
09:54:10 25 business.

09:54:11 1 And the Fifth Circuit cases that we cited all  
09:54:13 2 discuss how dismissing without prejudice on the eve of  
09:54:17 3 trial, you know, is prejudicial.

09:54:19 4 THE COURT: Well, Rule 41 specifically grants the  
09:54:25 5 District Court the discretion to impose conditions, and the  
09:54:32 6 condition that makes sense here would be the condition  
09:54:34 7 regarding payment of fees in the event that they are  
09:54:38 8 reurged. Obviously, that is intended also to be a  
09:54:45 9 disincentive to the Plaintiff to reurge those same patents  
09:54:51 10 in another forum.

09:54:53 11 If you have any argument as to why that wouldn't  
09:54:56 12 be a sufficient protection for Charter's interest in this  
09:55:02 13 regard, tell me about it.

09:55:03 14 MR. REISNER: Your Honor, we agree that it -- it  
09:55:07 15 largely alleviates the prejudice. We still think there's  
09:55:13 16 prejudice to just disruption of the business, but -- but  
09:55:16 17 certainly that goes a long way to protecting Charter  
09:55:18 18 against another suit.

09:55:20 19 THE COURT: All right. Then, thank you,  
09:55:23 20 Mr. Reisner.

09:55:24 21 I'll grant the Plaintiff's motion with the  
09:55:28 22 condition just mentioned, that if these same patents are  
09:55:32 23 reurged against Charter in other proceedings, that Entropic  
09:55:39 24 will be ordered to pay to Charter the fees and costs that  
09:55:47 25 Charter can show are attributable to its defense of those

09:55:53 1 patents in this action.

09:55:57 2 MR. ZHANG: Thank you, Your Honor.

09:55:57 3 THE COURT: All right. Then I know we also have a  
09:56:04 4 notice that the Plaintiff filed and that the Defendants  
09:56:09 5 have responded to now about issues that remained.

09:56:17 6 Maybe I can hear from the Plaintiff about what --  
09:56:21 7 what issues they think still remain outstanding after  
09:56:26 8 viewing the Defendant's response.

09:56:29 9 MR. SHIMOTA: Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you  
09:56:32 10 for your time.

09:56:33 11 We've talked this morning with counsel. The only  
09:56:38 12 issue that remains is Defendant's apparent intention to, I  
09:56:43 13 guess in their view, possibly call Dr. Goldberg on issues  
09:56:48 14 related to damages now which we think is improper. And if  
09:56:54 15 I may explain that to you further, I will. Otherwise, we  
09:56:58 16 believe that we have resolved all the issues that were --  
09:57:03 17 remained to be discussed today, with the caveat that -- I  
09:57:05 18 believe we had at the last pretrial conference raised the  
09:57:08 19 possibility of extending the trial time in this matter. So  
09:57:11 20 we just would like to know if that were the case, and if  
09:57:13 21 it's not, just so we can prepare for trial, but --

09:57:16 22 THE COURT: I do intend to reach that. And  
09:57:19 23 frankly, some of these issues affect the time that the  
09:57:24 24 Court thinks is appropriate.

09:57:26 25 So -- but that is on the agenda, as well.

09:57:30 1 MR. SHIMOTA: Thank you, Your Honor.

09:57:32 2 THE COURT: Talk to me about Dr. Goldberg.

09:57:34 3 MR. SHIMOTA: Yes, sir.

09:57:36 4 So Dr. Goldberg in this case was disclosed as

09:57:41 5 Defendant's invalidity expert. He provided opinions on

09:57:46 6 anticipation, obviousness, written description, enablement,

09:57:51 7 and Section 101 subject matter eligibility.

09:57:54 8 You granted summary judgment on some of those

09:57:57 9 issues, 101, for example. You also struck some of

09:58:00 10 Dr. Goldberg's opinions. And on Monday of this week,

09:58:03 11 pursuant to the DCO, Defendants notified us that they were

09:58:09 12 no longer going to pursue invalidity -- invalidity defenses

09:58:12 13 at trial. We thought, great.

09:58:15 14 On Tuesday morning, just as a housekeeping matter,

09:58:18 15 we sent them an email, amongst other things, asking them to

09:58:22 16 confirm that Dr. Goldberg would no longer be coming to

09:58:24 17 testify at trial so that we could prepare.

09:58:28 18 Their response was surprising. Their response was

09:58:31 19 that they now may, quote, unquote, may call Dr. Goldberg to

09:58:37 20 testify on patent damages. This was surprising. There's

09:58:43 21 nothing in Dr. Goldberg's report at all concerning patent

09:58:48 22 damages.

09:58:48 23 We had a meet and confer with them on Wednesday in

09:58:51 24 which we asked them to identify what paragraphs of

09:58:54 25 Dr. Goldberg's report pertain to patent damages. They said

09:59:00 1 that the Georgia-Pacific factors do identify the old  
09:59:05 2 modes -- they talk about -- you know, a damages expert can  
09:59:08 3 look at old modes that came before the invention, and  
09:59:12 4 people can consider the incremental advance of the  
09:59:15 5 invention over old modes.

09:59:17 6           But we -- again, we asked them: Where does this  
09:59:19 7 appear in Dr. Goldberg's report? They didn't tell us. We  
09:59:23 8 asked them again yesterday in an email: Please tell us  
09:59:26 9 what paragraphs of Dr. Goldberg's report relate to patent  
09:59:32 10 damages. It's not there.

09:59:33 11           I was looking at Dr. Goldberg's expert opinion,  
09:59:37 12 and I deposed him in this matter, and there's a section --  
09:59:40 13 the legal section. And he was candid, like all experts,  
09:59:43 14 and said, the lawyers helped me write this. There's  
09:59:46 15 nothing at all about damages there, zero, nothing. There's  
09:59:50 16 a legal description of the -- of anticipation, obviousness,  
09:59:55 17 written description, enablement, level of skill in the art.  
09:59:59 18 Indeed, they say that he's going to testify about the,  
10:00:02 19 quote, unquote, state of the art.

10:00:03 20           Literally, literally, the only place in this  
10:00:07 21 report that there's a -- the use of the words "state of the  
10:00:11 22 art" is in the section on enablement where one of the  
10:00:13 23 factors for enablement is the state of the art, and  
10:00:16 24 Dr. Goldberg said the lawyers wrote this. There's nothing  
10:00:19 25 for him to testify about.

10:00:20 1 I took his deposition, Your Honor. If we had been  
10:00:23 2 told at the time -- if we received fair disclosure, fair  
10:00:26 3 notice under Rule 26 that he was going to be a damages  
10:00:30 4 expert, I would have changed my deposition strategy. I  
10:00:33 5 would have asked him questions about that. But we didn't  
10:00:36 6 receive notice of that. We're receiving notice of that  
10:00:38 7 this week. This is trial by ambush.

10:00:41 8 And to underscore the point that he is not and  
10:00:44 9 never was a damages expert, Mr. Bakewell -- Mr. Bakewell  
10:00:46 10 testifies regularly in this court. There's nothing,  
10:00:49 11 there's zero in Mr. Bakewell's expert report on patent  
10:00:53 12 damages concerning discussions with Dr. Goldberg or his  
10:00:55 13 reliance upon Dr. Goldberg's report, nothing.

10:00:59 14 And so -- and just even more so in -- in the  
10:01:03 15 notice, the response to our notice they filed this morning,  
10:01:06 16 they state that they're not -- Dr. Goldberg is not going to  
10:01:09 17 testify about any of the prior art that's in his expert  
10:01:12 18 report. Well, then the question is what, then, is he going  
10:01:14 19 to talk about? Is he some kind of a fact witness who's  
10:01:18 20 going to testify about what came in those time periods?

10:01:20 21 He didn't have any of that in his report, and,  
10:01:23 22 indeed, I brought his deposition here. I asked him  
10:01:25 23 questions at the start of his deposition about his  
10:01:30 24 experience --

10:01:30 25 THE COURT: Mr. Shimota, why don't we do it this

10:01:33 1 way? Rather than you rebutting everything they might  
10:01:37 2 say --

10:01:38 3 MR. SHIMOTA: Okay.

10:01:38 4 THE COURT: -- let me hear what they do say, and  
10:01:41 5 then I'll give you a chance to respond.

10:01:44 6 MR. SHIMOTA: Fair enough. Sometimes I get wound  
10:01:47 7 up, Your Honor. Thank you.

10:01:47 8 THE COURT: Not a problem, Mr. Shimota.

10:01:48 9 MR. SHIMOTA: Thank you.

10:01:48 10 MR. DACUS: I'll try to lower the emotions in the  
10:01:52 11 room, Your Honor.

10:01:52 12 I do think this is -- this is simple, Your Honor.

10:01:54 13 Your Honor has had the privilege -- I'll put that in  
10:01:58 14 quotes -- of reading the deeply interesting motions to  
10:02:01 15 strike on the -- on the damages side of the case, and you  
10:02:04 16 know that apportionment is a very big issue for all three  
10:02:08 17 patents in the case and, specifically, our claim that the  
10:02:13 18 Plaintiff's expert has not apportioned.

10:02:16 19 All we propose that Dr. Goldberg do is talk about  
10:02:20 20 the existing prior art. He will not -- he will not be  
10:02:26 21 rendering any opinions as to invalidity. He will just be  
10:02:29 22 talking about the prior art that is in his report, and that  
10:02:32 23 goes to the apportionment issue, Your Honor.

10:02:36 24 THE COURT: So tell me what parts of his report  
10:02:39 25 you would intend to have him testify about.

10:02:44 1 MR. DACUS: So it's -- it's difficult to point the  
10:02:47 2 Court to the -- to the paragraphs, and I cannot do that  
10:02:49 3 right now, but I'd be happy to do that. But I will say  
10:02:52 4 generally, of course, because he has an invalidity report,  
10:02:55 5 his report is replete. You know, dozens of paragraphs  
10:02:59 6 related to the prior art that existed. And that goes  
10:03:03 7 directly to the apportionment issue and our claim that the  
10:03:07 8 Plaintiff has completely failed to apportion here. This  
10:03:10 9 is -- this is not a -- you --

10:03:14 10 THE COURT: Who would opine, based on that prior  
10:03:17 11 art, that the asserted patents are a small increment over  
10:03:24 12 the prior art?

10:03:25 13 MR. DACUS: In general, Mr. Bakewell does it. He  
10:03:30 14 does not do it relying on Dr. Goldberg. I -- I agree with  
10:03:34 15 counsel on that.

10:03:35 16 But throughout Mr. Bakewell's report, as the Court  
10:03:39 17 knows because you've seen these motions, our contention is  
10:03:43 18 that they completely failed to apportion for any of these  
10:03:47 19 three patents.

10:03:50 20 THE COURT: So I -- I understand that, you know,  
10:03:56 21 Dr. Bakewell can say whatever he will that's in his report.  
10:03:59 22 I'm just at this point focused on Dr. Goldberg and what  
10:04:08 23 parts of his report you would contend he can testify to the  
10:04:15 24 jury about since you have withdrawn the invalidity defense.

10:04:21 25 MR. DACUS: It would be the paragraphs in general,

10:04:25 1 Your Honor, and I'm not -- I'm not citing you to the  
10:04:26 2 specific ones, and I can if the Court requests it. We're  
10:04:29 3 happy to do that.

10:04:30 4 But in general, it is the paragraphs where he  
10:04:33 5 talks about the art that existed, the prior art, without  
10:04:41 6 rendering an opinion on validity because we -- we believe  
10:04:44 7 that prior art issue is directly relevant to the  
10:04:47 8 apportionment issue.

10:04:52 9 THE COURT: Well, I tell you what, I -- I have  
10:04:56 10 come out here, I believe, without exhibits, which I want to  
10:05:04 11 get to next, so I'm going to take a break at the moment to  
10:05:10 12 go do that.

10:05:11 13 I'll also pull up what we have of Dr. Goldberg's  
10:05:17 14 report, and I'd ask you to take a look, during the break,  
10:05:21 15 at some representative examples of the way you would intend  
10:05:28 16 to present this through Dr. Goldberg so that I can have a  
10:05:32 17 little better understanding and so that Mr. Shimota can  
10:05:36 18 have a target.

10:05:37 19 MR. DACUS: Understood, Your Honor. And I will  
10:05:39 20 say with respect to the -- what the Court anticipates  
10:05:42 21 doing, you said something about exhibits and maybe depo  
10:05:46 22 designations. I'm not -- I think we have resolved all of  
10:05:47 23 those issues.

10:05:48 24 THE COURT: All right. There were -- the last  
10:05:53 25 three buckets, I think, that were on the list from last

10:05:56 1 time we did not reach because they were assumed to rise and  
10:06:00 2 fall with certain motions. And I just need to get back to  
10:06:04 3 those and confirm that they have risen or fallen.

10:06:08 4 MR. DACUS: Understood, Your Honor. My under --  
10:06:10 5 we'll talk over the break.

10:06:10 6 THE COURT: Okay.

10:06:11 7 MR. DACUS: My understanding is we've resolved it  
10:06:13 8 all, but --

10:06:15 9 THE COURT: All right. Well, that -- that would  
10:06:16 10 be welcomed news.

10:06:16 11 MR. DACUS: Yes, Your Honor.

10:06:17 12 THE COURT: And we'll check on you in a minute and  
10:06:19 13 give you what -- the time you need and then come back and  
10:06:23 14 deal with Dr. Goldberg.

10:06:23 15 MR. DACUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

10:06:24 16 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

10:06:25 17 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

10:06:25 18 (Recess.)

10:19:04 19 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

10:19:06 20 THE COURT: Good morning again. Please be seated.

10:19:33 21 Except for you, Mr. Dacus.

10:19:36 22 MR. DACUS: All right. At least you said it with  
10:19:43 23 a smile.

10:19:46 24 So, Your Honor, where -- I think -- is it okay to  
10:19:48 25 proceed, Your Honor?

10:19:49 1 THE COURT: Yes.

10:19:49 2 MR. DACUS: Thank you.

10:19:51 3 So consistent with what we were saying, Your  
10:19:55 4 Honor, this is a situation where Dr. Goldberg would simply  
10:20:00 5 be testifying to exactly what is in his report, not outside  
10:20:03 6 of his report, and reciting to the jury what was in the  
10:20:09 7 prior art.

10:20:12 8 As an example, we've referred counsel to Paragraph  
10:20:15 9 247 of his report. Also Paragraph 270 does the same thing.  
10:20:21 10 And there's a multitude --

10:20:23 11 THE COURT: Let me get to one of those paragraphs.

10:20:25 12 MR. DACUS: Yes, sir. 247, Your Honor.

10:20:36 13 THE COURT: All right. I'm at that paragraph.

10:20:38 14 MR. DACUS: So in 247, the reference that's cited  
10:20:43 15 is this Caporizzo reference, and Dr. Goldberg has just a  
10:20:48 16 recitation of what Caporizzo disclosed. In other words,  
10:20:53 17 that's what's old, that's what's not incremental and new in  
10:20:57 18 this particular invention.

10:20:59 19 THE COURT: So that's -- it's the -- in other  
10:21:02 20 words, that could be the issue. Is the "in other words"  
10:21:06 21 that you're referring to in the Goldberg report?

10:21:10 22 MR. DACUS: The fact that -- when I said, "in  
10:21:17 23 other words," Your Honor, I'm trying to understand what  
10:21:19 24 you're asking me.

10:21:20 25 THE COURT: Oh, well, you said: In other words,

10:21:22 1 this is what is not -- this is what was in advance of the  
10:21:32 2 current patent, and, therefore, is not, you know, novel.

10:21:43 3 And I'm just trying to figure out -- are you  
10:21:46 4 really intending that Dr. Goldberg would simply say  
10:21:53 5 Caporizzo teaches as follows, and then that would be the  
10:21:56 6 end of that?

10:21:57 7 MR. DACUS: That -- that's correct, Your Honor.

10:21:58 8 And not -- not limited to this paragraph, but as in the  
10:22:01 9 general format, that's correct. And I'll -- I'll put a  
10:22:04 10 little finer point on this. I mean, part of the fight  
10:22:07 11 here, and Your Honor probably saw this from the briefing,  
10:22:10 12 is not only are these incremental add-on inventions to what  
10:22:18 13 already existed, what the Plaintiff's expert says, their  
10:22:23 14 technical expert, is that these patents are fundamental to  
10:22:29 15 the benefits that we receive. And they have done, in some  
10:22:36 16 instances, absolutely no apportionment for what did exist.

10:22:39 17 So you have the Plaintiff's technical expert on  
10:22:42 18 the one hand saying I didn't apportion at all, nor should  
10:22:46 19 you apportion at all because all of the benefit is derived  
10:22:49 20 from this particular patent.

10:22:51 21 What we want to say and have Dr. Goldberg  
10:22:55 22 contribute to that in part is to say: A large portion of  
10:22:58 23 this patent already existed in the prior art. And  
10:23:03 24 Dr. Goldberg would simply recite what did exist without any  
10:23:07 25 further conclusion.

10:23:08 1 THE COURT: Who is going to provide the  
10:23:11 2 conclusion?

10:23:11 3 MR. DACUS: I don't -- I don't think that we  
10:23:14 4 necessarily have someone to do -- to do that, nor do I  
10:23:19 5 think it's necessary that we provide that conclusion.

10:23:22 6 I will say Dr. -- I mean, Mr. Bakewell will opine,  
10:23:26 7 as he has, that the Plaintiff did no apportionment. And  
10:23:37 8 this all goes to that apportionment issue.

10:23:41 9 As the Court probably saw and remembers from the  
10:23:43 10 briefing, Mr. Bakewell does not go through and do some sort  
10:23:46 11 of detailed apportionment analysis where he says: Well,  
10:23:51 12 this -- this is new and this is old and this is how much I  
10:23:54 13 value at. It's simply a -- the law requires apportionment,  
10:23:59 14 and the Plaintiff completely failed to do it. And this is  
10:24:03 15 evidence in support of that.

10:24:16 16 We would not be going outside of Dr. Goldberg's  
10:24:19 17 report.

10:24:19 18 THE COURT: And that means also that the question  
10:24:23 19 to Dr. Goldberg wouldn't be something along the lines of:  
10:24:30 20 Dr. Goldberg, you analyzed the prior art. Can you tell us  
10:24:36 21 what -- what prior art references reveal some of what is  
10:24:49 22 claimed in the current patent? And then have him say this.

10:24:55 23 MR. DACUS: That's correct, Your Honor.

10:24:56 24 THE COURT: You would not?

10:24:57 25 MR. DACUS: No, we -- I think we would do that. I

10:25:01 1 mean --

10:25:01 2 THE COURT: Well, aren't you then supplying  
10:25:03 3 through him an opinion that is not in his report?

10:25:06 4 MR. DACUS: I don't think so, Your Honor.

10:25:08 5 THE COURT: Does his report say that Caporizzo  
10:25:18 6 teaches what it teaches here, and that is also part of what  
10:25:21 7 is claimed in the patent?

10:25:24 8 MR. DACUS: He does, Your Honor. Absolutely he  
10:25:26 9 does.

10:25:26 10 THE COURT: Where does he do that? That's what I  
10:25:30 11 guess I need to hear.

10:25:31 12 MR. DACUS: Understood, Your Honor. I may have to  
10:25:33 13 get help.

10:25:35 14 He does do that because, as the Court can likely  
10:25:38 15 appreciate -- I mean, this is an invalidity report. So if  
10:25:40 16 you just go to Paragraph 250, for example -- and I'm  
10:25:48 17 confident there are numerous examples where he says the  
10:25:52 18 particular piece of prior art discloses a limitation that  
10:25:56 19 is disclosed in the patents-in-suit.

10:26:11 20 THE COURT: Well, if what you're saying is that  
10:26:13 21 Dr. Goldberg is not going to say anything that's not within  
10:26:16 22 the four corners of this report --

10:26:19 23 MR. DACUS: That's absolutely true.

10:26:21 24 THE COURT: -- you're just not going to be arguing  
10:26:24 25 that that invalidates the patent?

10:26:25 1 MR. DACUS: That is likewise absolutely true, Your  
10:26:28 2 Honor, and we're happy to make that clear.

10:26:30 3 THE COURT: Okay. Then let me hear back from  
10:26:34 4 Plaintiff.

10:26:35 5 MR. SHIMOTA: Your Honor, I think you've hit the  
10:26:43 6 nail on the head here. I mean, this is -- Mr. Dacus was  
10:26:46 7 correct, this is an invalidity report. That's what it's  
10:26:49 8 titled. And so, obviously, they do -- Dr. Goldberg  
10:26:53 9 purported to do what is in an invalidity report, which is  
10:26:58 10 go through it element-by-element, but they're not now  
10:27:01 11 putting on an invalidity case.

10:27:04 12 And so, yes, they are going to ask him to reach  
10:27:06 13 the ultimate conclusion, which is different. The  
10:27:08 14 incremental advance over what was old and what's new is  
10:27:12 15 completely different from what is obvious. And so if he  
10:27:15 16 was going to offer an opinion about what was old and how  
10:27:19 17 valuable or not valuable the advance over the art was, he  
10:27:23 18 should have told us that. That should have been --  
10:27:25 19 Dr. Goldberg should have disclosed that in his report, and  
10:27:27 20 I would have deposed him on it.

10:27:29 21 And if they were going to rely upon that,  
10:27:31 22 Mr. Bakewell should have presented that in his report. He  
10:27:33 23 did not. We, of course, disagree that Mr. Dell didn't  
10:27:39 24 apportion, but Mr. Bakewell had a full and fair opportunity  
10:27:42 25 to respond and rely upon Dr. Goldberg. They didn't do it.

10:27:46 1 We didn't have a chance to look at this.

10:27:48 2 I want to put up on the ELMO something that we  
10:27:51 3 prepared in advance. Let's see here.

10:27:59 4 THE COURT: Just rotate it one more time. There  
10:28:02 5 you go.

10:28:02 6 MR. SHIMOTA: There we go. Yeah. So -- any  
10:28:05 7 better there?

10:28:06 8 So these are the introductions of his first expert  
10:28:09 9 report and his second expert report in which Dr. Goldberg  
10:28:13 10 very plainly states that his report is solely related to  
10:28:18 11 the invalidity of the claims.

10:28:21 12 And just to underscore the point, I took his  
10:28:23 13 deposition, and I asked him: What is your report about?

10:28:28 14 And he told me: Let me be clear, Mr. Shimota, my  
10:28:32 15 report is about invalidity.

10:28:34 16 If he'd told me at the time it was about damages,  
10:28:37 17 I would have asked him questions about that. We didn't.  
10:28:40 18 We learned this week that suddenly Dr. Goldberg is a  
10:28:43 19 damages expert. That's unfair surprise.

10:28:45 20 And let me just add one more point, Your Honor.  
10:28:50 21 Today is the first day where they started to identify  
10:28:53 22 paragraphs that Dr. Goldberg would rely upon. They  
10:28:55 23 identified Paragraph 270 of the report, which pertains to  
10:29:00 24 Claims 1 and 2 -- or Claim 1 of the '008 patent. Guess  
10:29:04 25 what, you granted summary judgment on that. They lost on

10:29:07 1 invalidity for that patent.

10:29:08 2 They're going to try to smuggle in their failed  
10:29:13 3 invalidity argument under the auspices of damages when you  
10:29:16 4 granted summary judgment on that. It can't possibly be.

10:29:19 5 You need to stop this.

10:29:20 6 THE COURT: Well, as long as Dr. Goldberg's  
10:29:24 7 testimony is held to the four corners of his report, how  
10:29:30 8 are you worse off that they are now saying they're not  
10:29:35 9 going to be seeking a finding of invalidity?

10:29:39 10 MR. SHIMOTA: Well, it's unfair surprise. The  
10:29:43 11 whole point of Rule 26 is that you get disclosure of the  
10:29:47 12 opinions that are going to be offered, and you're afforded  
10:29:50 13 a full and fair opportunity to cross-examine an expert on  
10:29:53 14 that.

10:29:53 15 If I -- if I -- as I said, if I had known -- if  
10:29:57 16 his report had stated that I'm going to offer damages  
10:30:00 17 opinions, we would have asked him questions about that.  
10:30:02 18 The trial is not the time to develop cross-examination.

10:30:06 19 The federal rules are clear --

10:30:08 20 THE COURT: These are not damages opinions that  
10:30:11 21 he's offering. These are opinions that may in some way  
10:30:18 22 relate to the damages opinion that someone else is going to  
10:30:22 23 offer.

10:30:23 24 But how does the use that the Defendant wants to  
10:30:28 25 put to the opinion change it?

10:30:31 1 MR. SHIMOTA: Well, what I would say first is  
10:30:33 2 invalidity is not part of the case. So now the evidence is  
10:30:37 3 both irrelevant and highly confusing to the jury. It  
10:30:41 4 just -- it just comes out of nowhere. So --

10:30:44 5 THE COURT: How is it confusing? They don't know  
10:30:46 6 that there ever was an invalidity claim, and they're going  
10:30:50 7 to hear that there is not one. So I don't see how that  
10:30:58 8 would confuse the jury.

10:31:00 9 MR. SHIMOTA: Well, because there's no -- there's  
10:31:02 10 no damages expert in this case who's going to testify.  
10:31:05 11 And, indeed, Mr. Dacus conceded that, that no one is going  
10:31:08 12 to testify, is going to make the critical linkage between  
10:31:11 13 the prior art that -- that Mr. Goldberg apparently is going  
10:31:14 14 to read -- Doctor, pardon me -- Dr. Goldberg apparently is  
10:31:18 15 going to read in the record and damages. So he apparently  
10:31:22 16 is going to come there, take a patent, read passages from a  
10:31:27 17 patent, and then sit down. That will be confusing to a  
10:31:29 18 jury.

10:31:30 19 And to the extent that he goes further than that,  
10:31:32 20 I, again, say that we should have had the opportunity to  
10:31:34 21 cross-examine him in a deposition. I didn't --

10:31:37 22 THE COURT: Does Mr. Bakewell offer the opinion  
10:31:39 23 that this -- the patents make a limited contribution to the  
10:31:48 24 prior art?

10:31:48 25 MR. SHIMOTA: No, he does not. All he does -- he

10:31:52 1 does not offer -- he -- in fact, Mr. Bakewell offers no  
10:31:55 2 affirmative opinion on damages. He doesn't have an opinion  
10:31:57 3 as to what they are. All he does is he -- is criticize  
10:32:01 4 Mr. Dell. He says Mr. Dell didn't apportion enough. He  
10:32:03 5 did a bad job.

10:32:05 6 He does not argue that, that there was some --  
10:32:09 7 that the patents aren't as valuable as we say, and they're  
10:32:11 8 only a small advance over the prior art. That's nowhere in  
10:32:15 9 the record. That's not going to be presented to the jury  
10:32:17 10 at this trial.

10:32:17 11 And so, again, I submit having Mr. -- Dr. Goldberg  
10:32:21 12 show up to apparently -- I mean, we don't even know what  
10:32:24 13 paragraphs he -- to this day, we've asked numerous times.  
10:32:28 14 We have a few snippet of paragraphs. We don't know what  
10:32:31 15 he's going to do, but apparently he's going to sit on the  
10:32:32 16 stand and take patents and read from them. That has  
10:32:36 17 nothing to do with any of the issues in the case, and  
10:32:36 18 it's --

10:32:36 19 THE COURT: You don't have that --

10:32:40 20 MR. SHIMOTA: -- highly prejudicial.

10:32:41 21 THE COURT: -- you don't have that information  
10:32:44 22 about any expert, do you, about what paragraphs of your  
10:32:47 23 report are you going to be relying upon in your testimony?

10:32:50 24 MR. SHIMOTA: Well, but at least we have fair  
10:32:52 25 notice for the other experts as to what might be in play.

10:32:54 1 I don't know what Dr. Goldberg -- what is  
10:32:56 2 potentially in play for him. We haven't -- I've learned  
10:32:58 3 today that it might be Paragraphs 247 and Paragraph 270.  
10:33:02 4 And as I identified for you, Paragraph 270 is one upon  
10:33:06 5 which you granted summary judgment of no invalidity. So on  
10:33:09 6 that one, it would be prejudicial for Dr. Goldberg to show  
10:33:12 7 up and say: Well, that there's -- that there's some  
10:33:15 8 difference between our claims -- or that the prior art  
10:33:17 9 discloses everything. So there's no real advance there  
10:33:20 10 because he was wrong. You ruled against him on that.

10:33:24 11 And so they shouldn't be able to do that. And so  
10:33:25 12 we don't -- we don't know. I mean, I agree with you, Your  
10:33:28 13 Honor, you never know precisely what a witness is going to  
10:33:31 14 testify until they take the stand in the trial, but at  
10:33:33 15 least you need to have some notice. And we don't have  
10:33:36 16 that. We simply don't.

10:33:38 17 THE COURT: Well, I guess -- frankly, I don't know  
10:33:47 18 everything that he's going to be saying or what portions of  
10:33:53 19 his report they can rely upon for the argument that they're  
10:33:56 20 now making, but my primary concern about experts is that  
10:34:02 21 they have fully disclosed their opinions and that they'll  
10:34:06 22 be held to those opinions at trial.

10:34:09 23 And even though they no longer -- the Defendant no  
10:34:16 24 longer has an invalidity defense, if there are opinions in  
10:34:22 25 Dr. Goldberg's report that are relevant to the remaining

10:34:26 1 issues, I don't know a basis to exclude them.

10:34:33 2 MR. SHIMOTA: Well, under -- as I said, under  
10:34:35 3 Rule -- in my view, Your Honor, respectfully, I think  
10:34:40 4 Rule 37 provides that there needs to be disclosure of  
10:34:42 5 opinions in advance. And these opinions -- 270, it's  
10:34:45 6 talking about a -- it reads: In my opinion, a POSITA would  
10:34:47 7 be highly motivated to combine Coyne with Caporizzo.  
10:34:52 8 That's the language of obviousness. There's no language in  
10:34:55 9 this report where there's a discussion of Caporizzo  
10:34:58 10 discloses X, and the incremental advance over Caporizzo is  
10:35:02 11 Y, and Y isn't particularly valuable.

10:35:04 12 If there was that, we would have been able to --  
10:35:07 13 to ask questions about that and say, I think you're wrong  
10:35:10 14 Dr. Goldberg. Have you considered this and this? That's  
10:35:13 15 not there. That's prejudicial. And so under Rule 37, I  
10:35:16 16 think you do have the authority to prevent Dr. Goldberg  
10:35:18 17 from offering this testimony. I mean, his opinions are --  
10:35:22 18 this is an invalidity report. He's -- he's speaking in the  
10:35:25 19 language of obviousness.

10:35:26 20 The three patents that are asserted in this case  
10:35:28 21 remaining, the only arguments that they -- that  
10:35:31 22 Dr. Goldberg advanced were claims of obviousness. He  
10:35:34 23 wasn't arguing that the prior art completely anticipated.

10:35:37 24 So his opinions are tied specifically on those  
10:35:41 25 elements to -- that's the language he's using. That's what

10:35:45 1 his opinions are. And that -- that is irrelevant, and it  
10:35:48 2 would be prejudicial. It has nothing to do with damages at  
10:35:50 3 all. It's different.

10:35:54 4 There's similarities in between Georgia-Pacific 9  
10:35:56 5 and obviousness, but they're separate legal inquiries, and  
10:36:00 6 that was not addressed by Dr. Goldberg in his report, and  
10:36:03 7 that's prejudicial.

10:36:03 8 THE COURT: All right.

10:36:04 9 MR. SHIMOTA: Thank you, Your Honor.

10:36:05 10 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shimota.

10:36:07 11 Mr. Dacus, one more thing. You have shown me the  
10:36:10 12 paragraphs where Dr. Goldberg discusses the prior art.

10:36:13 13 What I really haven't seen is an opinion that Dr. Goldberg  
10:36:25 14 offers that would be relevant for the reason you've set  
10:36:29 15 out, that he shows that it's only a minor advance over the  
10:36:34 16 prior art.

10:36:37 17 Can you point out an opinion that you think would  
10:36:41 18 still be relevant?

10:36:42 19 MR. DACUS: I may need to confer with my  
10:36:47 20 co-counsel, Your Honor, but I don't think there's opinions  
10:36:49 21 in there where he necessarily says that it is -- he doesn't  
10:36:53 22 say that it is a minor improvement or any improvement over  
10:36:57 23 the -- over the prior art, but --

10:37:00 24 THE COURT: Well -- and that's fine. I didn't  
10:37:02 25 mean to cabin you to that opinion, but any opinion that you

10:37:07 1 contend is still relevant. The paragraphs you pointed to  
10:37:13 2 originally are just opinions where he's quoting the prior  
10:37:20 3 art.

10:37:20 4 Where does he supply an opinion that relies upon  
10:37:24 5 that in a relevant fashion? And if you need to consult  
10:37:30 6 with other counsel, if you need another short break, I'm  
10:37:34 7 happy to give you that. But I -- I am concerned about  
10:37:39 8 saying that the witness can still go forward repurposed if  
10:37:47 9 there's no relevant opinion disclosed in his report.

10:37:51 10 MR. DACUS: And I think the -- the -- I'm not sure  
10:37:56 11 if the Court is focusing in on the word "opinion," but  
10:38:01 12 there are relevant facts in the report, Your Honor.

10:38:03 13 THE COURT: Well, the facts are only relevant if  
10:38:06 14 someone can show their relevance. And what I'm afraid that  
10:38:11 15 you want to do is have a lawyer be the one to show the  
10:38:16 16 relevance of those facts by providing the opinion that  
10:38:21 17 those facts show that it's only a minor advance. And I  
10:38:26 18 think that is inherently an opinion that needs to come from  
10:38:30 19 an expert.

10:38:30 20 MR. DACUS: And let me be clear. I don't think we  
10:38:35 21 intend on necessarily saying that it's a minor advance.  
10:38:38 22 Our purpose in putting this evidence forward is what  
10:38:43 23 Your Honor saw in the briefing, and that is to say for  
10:38:46 24 certain patents, particularly ones that are now at issue,  
10:38:50 25 Dr. -- Mr. Dell did no apportionment at all. And the

10:38:56 1 purpose of putting forth Dr. Goldberg is to say here  
10:39:01 2 factually is what was in the prior art.

10:39:06 3 When the Plaintiffs stand up and say, as they  
10:39:08 4 inevitably will, that this patent is fundamental to the  
10:39:13 5 benefit that Charter receives for PMA, for example, for  
10:39:17 6 that feature, and we did no apportionment at all, we  
10:39:20 7 attributed 100 percent to this patent, Mr. Bakewell has  
10:39:25 8 opined that apportionment was required.

10:39:29 9 And this is factual testimony in an expert  
10:39:33 10 report -- facts from an expert report that provide evidence  
10:39:37 11 of the fact that there -- there were elements or  
10:39:40 12 limitations of these patents that existed in the prior art.

10:39:54 13 THE COURT: And I guess what I am missing from  
10:39:56 14 that is who is going to make the connection that this prior  
10:40:01 15 art is talking about something that's within the scope of  
10:40:05 16 the asserted claims?

10:40:06 17 MR. DACUS: Oh, I think Mr. -- Dr. Goldberg does  
10:40:08 18 that for sure.

10:40:09 19 THE COURT: Well, and that's what I'm looking for  
10:40:13 20 is where there is an opinion like that that is relevant.

10:40:18 21 MR. DACUS: Understood, Your Honor.

10:41:12 22 So, Your Honor, if you look at Paragraph 271 --  
10:41:15 23 and I'll say just as an overarching comment, as the Court  
10:41:22 24 might expect, I mean, this does have invalidity opinions in  
10:41:26 25 it, so you can imagine by necessity the expert has in here

10:41:31 1 recitations of the prior art in tying those to the  
10:41:35 2 patents-in-suit, just as an overarching matter.

10:41:37 3 But specifically with respect to 271, Claim  
10:41:42 4 Limitation 1[c], Dr. Goldberg says is in the prior art  
10:41:47 5 reference Coyne. And, of course, we're talking about the  
10:42:01 6 '008 patent here, but it -- we have the same thing for all  
10:42:04 7 of the patents. We have Dr. Goldberg saying: The claim  
10:42:09 8 limitations at issue in this suit were in the prior art.

10:42:16 9 THE COURT: All right. And the '008 is still at  
10:42:21 10 issue. It's still asserted, right?

10:42:23 11 MR. DACUS: Yes, Your Honor.

10:42:24 12 THE COURT: So you're saying that in Paragraph  
10:42:28 13 271, there would be a basis for Dr. Goldberg to testify  
10:42:32 14 that part of what is claimed in the '008 patent is already  
10:42:45 15 taught in this pre-existing Coyne reference?

10:42:48 16 MR. DACUS: That's correct, Your Honor.

10:43:00 17 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from  
10:43:04 18 Mr. Shimota as to why that would not be a permissible use  
10:43:07 19 of Paragraph 271.

10:43:08 20 MR. SHIMOTA: Well, Your Honor, specifically with  
10:43:13 21 respect to Paragraph 271, I want to reiterate for you, we  
10:43:17 22 moved for summary judgment on Claim 1 of the '008 patent  
10:43:21 23 that they had not shown obviousness. You granted our  
10:43:25 24 motion. You stated that -- that they -- Dr. Goldberg was  
10:43:29 25 wrong. So now they're going to -- they're trying --

10:43:32 1 they're trying to have Dr. Goldberg testify about a theory  
10:43:34 2 that they wouldn't have been able to present to the jury on  
10:43:37 3 obviousness. He's wrong.

10:43:38 4 Moreover, you asked Dr. -- Mr. Dacus the question:  
10:43:44 5 Where in the report is there any discussion of an -- small  
10:43:49 6 advance, incremental advance, et cetera? There is none.

10:43:52 7 The language here is precisely in the context of  
10:43:56 8 obviousness. And so, again, this isn't a fair use of this.  
10:44:00 9 If they had said -- if there was a sentence in here that  
10:44:03 10 said, moreover, this is an incremental advance and it's not  
10:44:06 11 particularly valuable -- you know, moreover, if I'm wrong  
10:44:08 12 on obviousness, the differences between the claims and the  
10:44:11 13 prior art were so small that it's not valuable, I could  
10:44:15 14 asked him questions about that, but he didn't answer those  
10:44:19 15 questions.

10:44:19 16 And you see, it's -- the bigger problem is that  
10:44:21 17 this is -- right now they're literally on the fly finding  
10:44:24 18 paragraphs that he's going to be testifying to. And it  
10:44:26 19 shows, right? They're pointing you to paragraphs that you  
10:44:31 20 granted summary judgment on.

10:44:32 21 THE COURT: You know --

10:44:33 22 MR. SHIMOTA: Mr. Bakewell -- I'm sorry. I didn't  
10:44:36 23 mean to cut you off, Your Honor.

10:44:36 24 THE COURT: The summary judgment on obviousness  
10:44:39 25 related to entire claims, not just limitations like this

10:44:40 1 paragraph.

10:44:41 2 MR. SHIMOTA: Uh-huh.

10:44:45 3 THE COURT: So --

10:44:47 4 MR. SHIMOTA: Yeah, but -- I'm sorry. I cut you  
10:44:47 5 off. Were you finished?

10:44:47 6 THE COURT: No. Go ahead.

10:44:48 7 MR. SHIMOTA: That's the point. If they just go  
10:44:50 8 to Paragraph 271 in isolation and say this isn't there,  
10:44:53 9 you're correct. They're then going to ask the question of,  
10:44:57 10 like, okay, well, how much of a difference is there? And  
10:45:01 11 if they don't ask that question, you're right. Is someone  
10:45:06 12 going to argue about this, because if someone is not even  
10:45:07 13 going to argue this evidence, then how on earth is it  
10:45:09 14 relevant?

10:45:09 15 And you're correct, if an attorney argues that the  
10:45:12 16 advance of the art over the -- or the advance of the  
10:45:15 17 invention over the art is, quote, unquote, incremental or  
10:45:18 18 not valuable, that's for an expert. That was for  
10:45:21 19 Mr. Bakewell to do, and he didn't do it.

10:45:24 20 I want to be clear, Mr. Bakewell doesn't offer an  
10:45:26 21 opinion that the advance over this art or Caporizzo or  
10:45:32 22 Coyne or whatever was so small that it wasn't valuable.  
10:45:35 23 All he does is he says: Mr. Dell is wrong. Mr. Dell did a  
10:45:39 24 bad job.

10:45:40 25 It's fine for him to say that, but they can't

10:45:43 1 bring in this new theory the last week before trial. It's  
10:45:45 2 just not fair. It's trial by surprise. I mean, there's  
10:45:48 3 not even time to do -- I mean, to depose Dr. Goldberg on  
10:45:51 4 his repurposed opinion that isn't even in this report. So  
10:45:55 5 that's why you simply shouldn't do it.

10:45:58 6 And I -- again, for them to be able to try and put  
10:46:00 7 on the theory that you granted summary judgment on for  
10:46:03 8 obviousness under the guise of damages or some  
10:46:08 9 Georgia-Pacific factor is not -- is not fair. I mean, I  
10:46:12 10 would just, again, submit to Your Honor they informed  
10:46:15 11 Dr. Goldberg on the law. There's nothing about the  
10:46:18 12 Georgia-Pacific factors in his report, nothing, zero. He  
10:46:23 13 knew nothing about it. There's no discussion of it.

10:46:26 14 They decided not to pursue an invalidity defense  
10:46:29 15 in this case, and then they made the strategic choice to  
10:46:32 16 try to repurpose it -- your language is right -- as a  
10:46:32 17 damages opinion, it's too late. It's unfair. It shouldn't  
10:46:35 18 be allowed.

10:46:36 19 THE COURT: All right.

10:46:38 20 MR. SHIMOTA: Thank you, Your Honor.

10:46:38 21 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shimota.

10:46:39 22 I am going to take a little bit of time and review  
10:46:48 23 Dr. Goldberg's report further, and I'll issue something in  
10:46:52 24 writing about whether or not the Court believes that the  
10:47:00 25 proposed use of Dr. Goldberg is a fair use in light of the

10:47:05 1 disclosure of his opinions.

10:47:08 2 And if you want to say any last words on that,  
10:47:11 3 Mr. Dacus, I'll be happy to give you that opportunity.

10:47:14 4 MR. DACUS: Just one thing, Your Honor. I mean,  
10:47:17 5 we've got a lot of discussion about opinions and what  
10:47:19 6 lawyers can say. Lawyers can, of course, apply the facts  
10:47:24 7 through the instructions that the Court gives. The Court  
10:47:26 8 is no doubt in this case going to give an instruction that  
10:47:30 9 apportionment is required. I'm confident -- I'm confident  
10:47:33 10 of very little in this case, but I'm confident of that.

10:47:36 11 And this goes directly to that issue upon which --  
10:47:42 12 as you know, Mr. Bakewell has said there is no  
10:47:44 13 apportionment by the Plaintiff. So the argument here,  
10:47:48 14 applying the facts to the law, say these things existed in  
10:47:52 15 the prior art previously. Mr. Dell, the Plaintiff's  
10:47:55 16 expert, did no apportionment with respect to them. And the  
10:47:57 17 Court's instructions say that he should have. I don't  
10:48:00 18 think it's any more complicated than that.

10:48:03 19 THE COURT: And another issue that I'm going to  
10:48:07 20 look at this report about is whether there was fair notice  
10:48:12 21 that Dr. Goldberg would be testifying about anything other  
10:48:17 22 than invalidity.

10:48:19 23 MR. DACUS: He's testifying -- I mean, his report  
10:48:26 24 is on matters that relate to what was in the prior art,  
10:48:36 25 what the state of the art was. As Mr. Shimota said, he

10:48:41 1 read a paragraph that said what the state of the art is.  
10:48:45 2 In my experience, Your Honor, it is not  
10:48:46 3 uncommon -- in fact, it occurs in almost every case -- that  
10:48:49 4 you take what the invalidity expert said and you apply that  
10:48:53 5 with respect to the apportionment issue. And I don't think  
10:48:57 6 it's any different here.

10:48:59 7 THE COURT: Well, I guess in those cases, there is  
10:49:04 8 an invalidity defense, and the expert is testifying about  
10:49:06 9 that defense.

10:49:07 10 And I agree that that testimony can be relied upon  
10:49:11 11 in different aspects of the case. But what I'm  
10:49:16 12 understanding is there will not be an invalidity defense in  
10:49:20 13 this case.

10:49:21 14 MR. DACUS: That's -- that's absolutely true, Your  
10:49:23 15 Honor.

10:49:23 16 THE COURT: All right. Well, I -- I think I  
10:49:26 17 understand the issue, and I'll try and -- and come to a  
10:49:31 18 definitive --

10:49:33 19 MR. DACUS: Thank you.

10:49:34 20 THE COURT: -- resolution of it.

10:49:41 21 MR. DACUS: Thank you, Your Honor.

10:49:42 22 THE COURT: Thank you.

10:49:43 23 As I understand it, that is the only issue that  
10:49:50 24 remained from the notice that the Plaintiff filed, I guess,  
10:49:55 25 the night before last.

10:49:57 1 Is that right, Mr. Shimota?

10:49:58 2 MR. SHIMOTA: That is correct, Your Honor. Thank  
10:50:00 3 you.

10:50:00 4 THE COURT: Tell me about the agreements then that  
10:50:07 5 have resolved the exhibit issues that were left unresolved  
10:50:11 6 after the last pretrial. And those are specifically, I  
10:50:20 7 guess -- I'm looking at the email with the bucket list, and  
10:50:26 8 Bucket 3 and then 6, 7, and 8 were --

10:50:33 9 MR. SHIMOTA: My understanding is Buckets 3, 7,  
10:50:36 10 and 8, that we've agreed that those will not be admitted,  
10:50:39 11 that's correct.

10:50:40 12 THE COURT: All right. Since they're Defendant's  
10:50:42 13 exhibits, I guess I need to hear that from them.

10:50:45 14 MR. SHIMOTA: Yes, sorry.

10:50:47 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

10:50:47 16 MR. DACUS: That's the first thing Mr. Shimota has  
10:50:49 17 said today that's accurate, Your Honor.

10:50:57 18 THE COURT: I would say --

10:50:57 19 MR. SHIMOTA: Hoping once a day, twice a day, I  
10:50:58 20 believe so. There you go.

10:50:58 21 THE COURT: -- it's faint praise perhaps?

10:51:03 22 So do both sides then have a list of their  
10:51:11 23 pre-admitted exhibits that we can get filed today that has  
10:51:17 24 been agreed to by the other side?

10:51:18 25 MR. SHIMOTA: Yeah, we'll get that to you this

10:51:21 1 afternoon.

10:51:22 2 THE COURT: All right.

10:51:22 3 MR. DACUS: Yes, Your Honor.

10:51:24 4 THE COURT: All right. What about the email that

10:51:25 5 came in yesterday evening about deposition designations?

10:51:32 6 Have those been resolved, too?

10:51:34 7 MR. SHIMOTA: Yes, Your Honor, that has been  
10:51:35 8 resolved.

10:51:36 9 THE COURT: All right. And so those depositions  
10:51:41 10 may be used on Monday? Is that the understanding?

10:51:46 11 MR. SHIMOTA: The designations. The issue was  
10:51:47 12 that we had an issue over the counter-designations for one  
10:51:51 13 witness, Mr. Boglioli. We're now no longer going to play  
10:51:54 14 deposition testimony from Mr. Boglioli, so the  
10:51:58 15 counter-designation issue is moot.

10:51:59 16 THE COURT: All right. So the -- perhaps the only  
10:52:06 17 issue remaining is the trial time.

10:52:07 18 MR. SHIMOTA: That's correct, Your Honor, I  
10:52:10 19 believe.

10:52:10 20 THE COURT: The case has been narrowed somewhat.  
10:52:13 21 Certainly it went from six patents to three patents, and  
10:52:18 22 some of the additional experts have been resolved.

10:52:22 23 What is the Plaintiff's position now on the trial  
10:52:29 24 time that the Plaintiff needs?

10:52:31 25 MR. SHIMOTA: Your Honor, still -- while the case

10:52:34 1 has been narrowed, there are -- remain three patents, and I  
10:52:34 2 believe the issues are fairly complex. So I believe that  
10:52:38 3 an enlargement of two hours would still be our preference.  
10:52:41 4 Obviously, we'll work with whatever time we are given, but  
10:52:43 5 that remains our preference.

10:52:45 6 THE COURT: So that would be 14 hours is what  
10:52:47 7 you're telling me?

10:52:47 8 MR. SHIMOTA: That's correct. Yes, Your Honor.

10:52:49 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Shimota.

10:52:50 10 MR. SHIMOTA: Thank you, Your Honor.

10:52:51 11 THE COURT: Mr. Dacus, what about your side?

10:52:53 12 MR. DACUS: We think that's likely accurate, Your  
10:52:56 13 Honor, 14 hours. We don't request any more than 14 hours.

10:53:00 14 THE COURT: All right. Then 14 hours will be the  
10:53:03 15 order as far as time for presentation of the evidence.

10:53:08 16 And I will dig into Dr. Goldberg's report and try  
10:53:17 17 to get something out promptly on that.

10:53:21 18 I understand that the juror notebooks have been  
10:53:24 19 delivered to chambers. Are there any issues regarding  
10:53:29 20 that?

10:53:30 21 MR. LITTMANN: Sorry, I stood up for a different  
10:53:33 22 reason, Your Honor, but I don't believe there are any  
10:53:35 23 issues on that.

10:53:36 24 MR. DACUS: There are no issues, Your Honor.

10:53:37 25 THE COURT: All right. Then for what reason are

10:53:41 1 you standing up?

10:53:43 2 MR. LITTMANN: Just -- just to -- I believe we

10:53:45 3 have agreement with Defendant here that the testimony of --

10:53:50 4 that there will be no testimony from either Mr. Taylor or

10:53:52 5 Mr. Cary. Those were two other issues that were there that

10:53:57 6 were outstanding, and so I just -- as we were talking about

10:53:58 7 the hours and everything else, I wanted to make sure the

10:54:01 8 Court had full information on that, as well.

10:54:03 9 THE COURT: And I think that's in their written

10:54:05 10 response to your notice --

10:54:06 11 MR. LITTMANN: Correct.

10:54:06 12 THE COURT: -- right?

10:54:08 13 MR. LITTMANN: Thank you.

10:54:08 14 MR. DACUS: I guess the only asterisk or caveat on

10:54:12 15 that, Your Honor, is we have objected to some of the

10:54:14 16 rulings from Your Honor. So if the Court were to --

10:54:18 17 THE COURT: And I understand that.

10:54:19 18 MR. DACUS: -- do something with respect to

10:54:21 19 licensing, for example, we might call those folks, but

10:54:24 20 counsel is correct, as of now, we are not calling those

10:54:27 21 folks.

10:54:27 22 THE COURT: I do understand that, that certainly

10:54:31 23 those issues are ultimately pending before Judge Gilstrap.

10:54:36 24 All right. Well, I don't think there's anything

10:54:42 25 else. I'll let y'all get back to preparing for Monday.

10:54:45 1 MR. DACUS: Thank you, Your Honor.  
10:54:47 2 MR. REISNER: Thank you, Your Honor.  
10:54:48 3 MR. SHIMOTA: Thank you, Your Honor.  
10:54:50 4 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.  
10:54:53 5 (Hearing concluded 10:54 a.m.)  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability.

9           /S/ Shelly Holmes  
0         SHELLY HOLMES, CSR, TCRR  
1         CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER  
1         State of Texas No.: 7804  
1         Expiration Date: 10/31/2023

12/8/2023  
Date